

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ANTHONY MITCHELL, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF HENDERSON, NEVADA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01154-APG-CWH

**ORDER TEMPORARILY SEALING  
EXHIBITS**

(ECF No. 122)

The City of Henderson requests the sealing of three exhibits and all references to them in deposition transcripts that are attached to one of the plaintiffs' filings. ECF No. 122. Blanket sealing of entire documents is disfavored; rather, only specific portions of an exhibit should be sealed unless the entire document is truly confidential. *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006). Henderson does not point out the specific portions of the exhibits to be sealed, nor does it identify the pages and lines of the deposition transcripts. I have briefly reviewed those exhibits, and significant portions do not appear to involve confidential information. Nevertheless, the motion raises important issues of privacy.

As an interim solution, Henderson's motion to seal (ECF No. 122) is **TEMPORARILY GRANTED**. The clerk of court shall seal ECF Nos. 119-1, 119-2, 119-3, 119-4, 119-6, and 119-7. The parties shall confer to determine which exhibits or portions thereof should remain sealed. If an agreement is reached, the parties shall file a stipulation identifying those portions of the exhibits that should be sealed and explaining why sealing is appropriate. If no agreement is reached, Henderson shall file a supplement identifying those portions that should remain sealed and why. The stipulation or supplement is due by February 15, 2017. The other parties may respond to Henderson's supplement within 10 days thereafter.

DATED this 1st day of February, 2017.

  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE